

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
SUMIT GARG,  
  
Defendant.

CASE NO. CR21-0045-JCC  
  
ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's motion to compel witness contact information (Dkt. No. 334) and accompanying motion explaining good cause (Dkt. No. 335). Having thoroughly considered the parties' briefing and the relevant record, the Court finds oral argument unnecessary and hereby DENIES the motion (Dkt. No. 334) for the reasons explained herein.

Defendant asks the Court to compel the Government to produce the contact information of the alleged victims in this case. (Dkt. No. 334 at 1.) However, Defendant must first show good cause why his motion could not have been filed prior to the pretrial motions deadline. (Dkt. No. 207.) He fails to do so. As Defendant notes, previous defense counsel reported to him that he was unable to locate three of the alleged victims. (Dkt. No. 335 at 1.) At that time, defense counsel could have filed a motion similar to the one currently before the Court, but declined to do so. And the motions deadline has subsequently passed. So the Court DENIES Defendant's motion

1 (Dkt. No. 335) as untimely.<sup>1</sup>

2 For the foregoing reasons, Defendant's motions (Dkt. Nos. 334, 335) are DENIED.

3 DATED this 10th day of April 2023.

4  
5  
6 

7 John C. Coughenour  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

---

24 <sup>1</sup> Even if the motion was timely, it fails on the merits. The Government is not required to provide  
25 a witness list to Defendant at this time. *See* CrR 16(a)(2)(E), 23.3. And unlike the cases  
26 Defendant cites, the Government does not appear to have tried to hide any witnesses or to have  
withheld exculpatory evidence. (*See generally* Dkt. No. 334.) So even if there were good cause,  
Defendant's motion fails on the merits.